Table 1. Summary of Tar Results (mg/cigt.)

	QA 1990 Year Average	Specification Tar	Philip Morris Advertised Tar[1]	TITL Market Sample #32[2]	TITL Market Sample #33[3]
Alpine 80 Menthol (Box)	14.8	15.0	15	15	15.2
Alpine 85 Menthol	15.2	15.0	15	17	15.6
Alpine Lights 85 Menthol	10.1	10.0	9	9	9.3
Alpine Lights 80 Men. (Box)	9.9	10.0	10	10	9.0
Alpine 100 Menthol	15.1	15.0	15	15	14.7
Alpine Lights 100 Menthol	10.2	10.0	9	9	9.4
Benson & Hedges 85 (Box)	14.5	14.5	15	15	14.9
Benson & Hedges 100	16.5	16.0	17	17	15.7
Benson & Hedges 100 Menthol	16.0	16.0	16	16	15.7
Benson & Hedges 100 (Box)	16.1	16.0	16	16	15.7
Benson & Hedges Men. 100 (Box)	16.0	16.0	16	16	15.9
Benson & Hedges Lights 100	10.9	10.5	11	11	10.4
Benson & Hedges Lights 100 (Box)	11.0	10.5	11	11	10.8
Benson & Hedges Lights Men. 100	11.1	10.5	11	11	9.9
Benson & Hedges Lights Men. 100 (Box)	11.1	10.5	10	10	10.3
Benson & Hedges DeLuxe Ultra Lights 100 (Box)	6.0	6.0	5	5	5.0
Benson & Hedges DeLuxe Ultra Lights Menthol 100 (Box)	5.9	6.0	5	5	4.4
B & H Multifilter 85	11.4	11.5	11	11	10.9
Cambridge Ultra Lights 100	4.8	5.0	4	4	4.0
Cambridge Lights 85	11.9	12.0	12	12	11.5
Cambridge Lights Menthol 85	12.4	12.0	12	12	11.6
Cambridge Lights 100	11.9	12.0	12	12	11.5
Cambridge Lights Menthol 100	12.1	12.0	12	12	11.2
Cambridge Full Flavor 85	16.4	16.0	17	17	16.5
Cambridge Full Flavor 100	16.2	16.0	17	17	16.7
Cantrex 100 10/s 85 (Box)	8.7	9.0	N.L.	9	8.1
Cantrex 100 20/s (Box)	9.2	9.0	9	9	8.3
Cantrex 100 20/s Men. (Box)	9.5	9.0	9	9	8.4

PM3001014694

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/rrkk0001

Table 1. Summary of Tar Results (mg/cigt.)

	QA 1990 Year Average	Specification Tar	Philip Morris Advertised Tar[1]	TITL Market Sample #32[2]	TITL Market Sample #33[3]
Cavalier 100 10's Menthol (Box)	9.2	9.0	N.L.	8	8.4
Commander Regular 70 (NF)	20.4	19.0	24	24	21.8
Commander King (NF)	23.0	23.0	26	26	26.4
English Ovals 85 (Box) NF	21.3	22.0	23	23	23.1
Marlboro 80 (Box)	16.2	16.0	17	17	15.7
Marlboro 85	16.2	16.0	17	17	15.8
Marlboro 85 25's	16.1*	16.0	17	17	15.8
Marlboro Lights 85	11.0	11.0	11	11	10.6
Marlboro Lights 85 25's	10.7*	11.0	11	11	10.8
Marlboro Lights 85 (Box)	11.0	11.0	11	11	10.5
Marlboro Lights 100	10.8	11.0	11	11	10.1
Marlboro Lights 100 (Box)	10.9	11.0	11	11	10.0
Marlboro Menthol 85	15.1	15.0	16	16	15.9
Marlboro 100	16.2	16.0	16	16	15.5
Marlboro 100 (Box)	16.1	16.0	17	17	15.8
Marlboro Lights Menthol 85 (Box)	10.0	10.0	10	10	9.3
Marlboro Lights Menthol 100 (Box)	10.2	10.0	10	10	9.3
Marlboro Ultra Lights 85 (Red Box)	5.7	6.0	6	N.L.	5.4
Marlboro Ultra Lights 85 (Silver Box)	5.3	6.0	6	N.L.	5.3
Marlboro Ultra Lights 100 (Red Box)	6.2	6.0	6	N.L.	5.8
Marlboro Ultra Lights 100 (Silver Box)	6.2	6.0	6	N.L.	6.0
Merit Ultra Lights 85	5.0	5.0	5	5	4.2
Merit Ultra Lights 85 (Box)	4.8	5.0	5	5	4.5
Merit Ultra Lights Menthol 85	5.4	5.0	5	5	4.7
Merit Ultra Lights 100	5.7	6.0	5	5	5.3
Merit Ultra Lights 100 (Box)	6.1	6.0	6	6	5.8

PM3001014695

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/rrkk0001

Table 1. Summary of Tar Results (mg/cigt.)

	QA 1990 Year Average	Specification Tar	Philip Morris Advertised Tar[1]	TITL Market Sample #32[2]	TITL Market Sample #33[3]
Merit Ultra Lights Men. 100	5.8	6.0	5	5	4.6
Merit 85 (Box)	7.9	8.0	8	8	7.3
Merit 85	7.7	8.0	8	8	7.4
Merit Menthol 85	8.4	8.0	8	8	7.6
Merit 100	10.0	10.0	10	10	9.1
Merit Menthol 100	10.1	10.0	10	10	9.3
Merit De-Nic Low Tar 85	8.7*	**	9	9	8.1
Merit De-Nic Low Tar Men. 85	8.4*	**	9	9	7.7
Merit De-Nic Ultra Low Tar 85	3.6*	**	N.L.	4	3.3
Merit De-Nic Ultra Low Tar Menthol 85	3.6*	**	N.L.	4	3.0
Next De-Nic Low Tar 85	9.2	9.0	9	9	8.0
Next De-Nic Low Tar Menthol 85	9.4	9.0	9	9	7.5
Next De-Nic Low Tar 100	9.1	9.0	9	9	8.7
Next De-Nic Low Tar 100 Men.	9.2	9.0	9	9	9.7
Next De-Nic Ultra Low Tar 85	4.0*	4.0	N.L.	4	3.5
Next De-Nic Ultra Low Tar Menthol 85	3.4*	4.0	N.L.	4	3.2
Next De-Nic Ultra Low Tar 100	5.1*	6.0	N.L.	6	5.0
Next De-Nic Ultra Low Tar Menthol 100	5.5*	6.0	N.L.	6	4.5
Parliament Lights 85 (Box)	8.9	9.0	9	9	8.4
Parliament Lights 85	9.1	9.0	9	9	9.1
Parliament Lights 100	11.6	11.5	12	12	11.5
Philip Morris International 100 (Box)	16.1	16.0	17	17	16.5
Philip Morris International Menthol 100 (Box)	16.8	16.0	17	17	16.6
Players 70 NF (Box)	22.4	22.0	25	25	24.5
Players 85 (Box)	11.9	12.0	12	12	11.4

PM3001014696

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/rrkk0001

Table 1. Summary of Tar Results (mg/cigt.)

	QA 1990 Year Average	Specification Tar	Philip Morris Advertised Tar[1]	TITL Market Sample #32[2]	TITL Market Sample #33[3]
Players 85 Menthol (Box)	11.4	12.0	12	12	11.2
Players 100 (Box)	13.9	14.0	14	14	13.4
Players 100 Menthol (Box)	14.5	14.0	14	14	13.6
Players Lights 85 25's	10.0	10.0	10	10	9.9
Players Lights 85 Menthol 25's	10.0	10.0	10	10	9.6
Players Lights 100 25's	11.9	12.0	12	12	11.0
Players Lights 100 Menthol 25's	12.2	12.0	11	12	10.8
Saratoga 120 (Box)	14.5	14.5	15	15	14.7
Saratoga 120 Menthol (Box)	14.4	14.5	15	15	13.8
Virginia Slims 100	14.6	14.5	15	15	14.3
Virginia Slims Menthol 100	14.8	14.5	15	15	14.4
Virginia Slims Lights 100 (Box)	8.9	9.0	9	9	8.2
Virginia Slims Lights 100 Men. (Box)	8.8	9.0	9	9	7.6
Virginia Slims Lights 120 (Box)	14.0	14.0	14	14	13.4
Virginia Slims Lights 120 Men. (Box)	13.9	14.0	14	14	13.3
Virginia Slims Ultra Lights 100 (Box)		5.8	5	5	5.1
Virginia Slims Ultra Lights Menthol 100 (Box)	5.8	6.0	5	5	4.8
Virginia Slims Superslims 100 (Box)	5.5	6.0	6	6	6.0
Virginia Slims Superslims Menthol 100 (Box)	5.8	6.0	6	6	5.3

[1] Purcell, Clare, "Tar and Nicotine Numbers," memo to Distribution, August 23, 1990.

[2] Steele, William L., letter to William F. Kuhn, March 13, 1991.

[3] Steele, William L., letter to William F. Kuhn, March 11, 1991.

*Cigarette Testing Services data

**No record of tar specification in 1990.

N.L. = Not Listed

PM3001014697

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/rrkk0001